



Early Journal Content on JSTOR, Free to Anyone in the World

This article is one of nearly 500,000 scholarly works digitized and made freely available to everyone in the world by JSTOR.

Known as the Early Journal Content, this set of works include research articles, news, letters, and other writings published in more than 200 of the oldest leading academic journals. The works date from the mid-seventeenth to the early twentieth centuries.

We encourage people to read and share the Early Journal Content openly and to tell others that this resource exists. People may post this content online or redistribute in any way for non-commercial purposes.

Read more about Early Journal Content at <http://about.jstor.org/participate-jstor/individuals/early-journal-content>.

JSTOR is a digital library of academic journals, books, and primary source objects. JSTOR helps people discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content through a powerful research and teaching platform, and preserves this content for future generations. JSTOR is part of ITHAKA, a not-for-profit organization that also includes Ithaka S+R and Portico. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.

Page 12—1. 24. For *Tu n'as fait que* read: *Tu m'as fait, que*.

14—1. 22. "*Vous fouilliez bien*: You were digging well." To search well everywhere etc.

18—1. 6. "*Que je les eusse*." I do not understand what the "omission of *je*" has to do here. *Je* is not omitted.

20—1. 6. *C'est à qui . . .* because each wants to be the first." (?)

23—1. 20. *C'est une chose où vous ne me réduirez pas*. *Où* is still used in such sentences and is more elegant than "*à laquelle*."—But *où* standing for *que* in: *C'est dans cette occasion où je pourrais dire* (Mad. de Sévigné), is no longer allowable.

29—1. 4. "*Lorsqu'on s'offre de . . .* When every body." When anybody.

34—1. 31. No note for *Trou-Madame*, a game: Troll my dames, in which the players try to place balls in nine holes (Webster).

42—1. 22. The signing of the contract (before a notary-public) does not constitute to-day the civil marriage, which always takes place before the *maire* or the *adjoint*.

43—1. 15. No note for "*Orges mondés* or *orges perlés*, i. e., barley of which the husks have been removed. It is used in soups and to make cooling draughts.

43—1. 19. Why not explain *propreté* by *parure*?

48—1. 1. *Souper*. For *aufen* read *saufen*, and add: O.H.G. *sufan* cognate to *sop*.

57—1. 29. "*La chandelle*, the article indicating that every tallow-candle is separately set down."—No more than *le pain*; the article before *chandelle* generalises the meaning.

58—1. 20. *Lésine*. "In the xviith century a number of Italian cobblers formed a fraternity for purposes of economy, called *Lesina*, ostensibly by mending each other's shoes free of charge."—Certainly not Italian *cobblers*; why should they mend each other's shoes, and each not mend his own?

74—1. 12. *Un train*, "A retinue." *Un train* means here a costume.

CASIMIR ZDANOWICZ.

Vanderbilt University.

'NOT . . . NOR' OR 'NOT . . . OR.'

TO THE EDITORS OF MOD. LANG. NOTES:

SIRS: I am at a loss to understand PROF. TOLMAN's remarks in your May number on my paper "*Not . . . Nor* or *Not . . . or*?" printed in February. If there was any one thing that I supposed I brought out clearly, it was that usage in regard to these collocations is to-day all but hopelessly divided. Hence, when PROF. TOLMAN says that "in most of the cases under discussion . . . good usage offers us two forms," he simply repeats what I proved by the most abundant citation.

Secondly, I cannot find anywhere in my paper the "suggestion that the best English has perhaps cast out *not . . . nor* in favor of *not . . . or*." I do say that the ordinary "double negative" (for example, "*I won't* have *nothing* to do with you") is now unquestionably bad, and I *propose* that *not . . . or* shall be substituted in certain cases for *not . . . nor*; but I do not even hint (for I never believed) that usage *has* cast out *not . . . nor* in any case.

Thirdly, PROF. TOLMAN's example, "Wealth does *not* always give power, *nor* do undeniable talents in all cases secure for the possessor even a moderate degree of worldly success," is the exact counterpart of the examples cited by me as those in which *not . . . nor must* be retained.

Finally, I fail to appreciate the increased emphasis of *nor* over *or* in such cases as, "Do not walk *nor* (*or*) trespass on the railroad." Surely, in 'In Memoriam,' C., cited by me in February, there is no difference between

No gray old grange, *or* lonely fold,

and

No gray old grange,

Nor hoary knoll of ash and haw.

The "suggestion" that I did make was that it might be worth while to *differentiate* the two expressions, writing *or* between the members of sentences and *nor* between independent *clauses*, *sentences*, and *paragraphs*. Nor can I see how this suggestion restricts the "freedom" of the language; it simply puts a general law in place of general license.

JNO. G. R. McELROY.

University of Pennsylvania.